UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,080	09/04/2001	Junko Fukuda	213304US6	1165

22850 7590 05/14/2004

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
CASCHERA, ANTONIO A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2676	6

DATE MAILED: 05/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/944,080	FUKUDA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Antonio A Caschera	2676	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 April 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *2,4,10,12,18,20,26 and 28* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,5-9,11,13-17,19,21-25,27 and 29-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *04 September 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in the pending application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 7-9, 15-17, 23-25, 31, 33 and 35, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bird (U.S. Patent 5,341,154), Chew et al. (U.S. Patent 6,727, 917 B1) and further in view of Lin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,552,738 B1).

In reference to claims 1 and 9, Bird discloses a compact computer having a base with an alphanumeric keyboard and a display screen pivotally connected to the base so that it can fold inwards towards the base or pivot into a position facing away from the base (see column 2, lines 9-15, Figure 1 and Figure 5). Bird also discloses a first operating means operable under the condition where the back surface of the display body is close to the base by using a stylus and touch screen display (see column 7, lines 4-14). Bird discloses the stylus to be used by a user to select an item from a menu being displayed on the touch screen display (see column 7, lines 38-40). Note, the office interprets the compact computer of Bird functionally equivalent to the

information processing device of applicant's claims. Bird also discloses a retractable keypad which, the office interprets, may be used under the condition where the back surface of the display body is close to the base (see column 2, lines 59-62, #40 of Figures 3 and 5). Note, the office interprets the keypad located "outside" of the display body (see #40 Figure 3 is not apart of the display body) and the stylus provided on the display body but outside of the display screen as the stylus is connected to the display body using a pivot point located "outside" of the display screen (see column 7, lines 3-6 and 19-20 and #75 and 76 of Figure 5). Bird does not explicitly disclose using the keypad to select a processing item to be executed from a system menu however it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a keypad to navigate and select a menu item as it is well known in the art that a keypad can also be used as a selectable input device (#8 key = up, #4 key = left, #6 key = right, #2 key = down and enter) (Official Notice). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for Bird to implement the retractable keypad as a selectable input device because it is well known in the art that a keypad can mimic the functions of a keyboard's directional arrow keys and also includes an enter key for making the selection (see Response to Arguments below). Although Bird also discloses that, "...the stylus tip provides an electrical signal which can be used to indicate the selection of a particular point on the display screen by the user," (see column 7, lines 34-37), Bird does not explicitly disclose displaying a system menu showing processing items based on said OS program on the display based on an operation of the stylus however Chew et al. does. Chew et al. discloses a user interface for palm sized computing devices whereby the user implements a stylus by tapping on the display screen which in turns displays a navigation menu (see column 1, lines 62-64, column 5, lines 6-10 and #86, 320 and 324 of

Figure 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to display a system menu by utilizing the stylus of Bird as such functionally is explicitly state as well known in the art by Chew et al. (see column 5, lines 6-10). Although Bird discloses the compact computer to comprise of a microcontroller along with memory devices (see column 3, lines 52-54), Bird does not explicitly disclose the compact computer executing application programs however, Lin et al. does. Lin et al. discloses a method and apparatus providing a user interface for control of a display device via a computer system (see columns 1-2, lines 66-7). Lin et al. discloses the computer system including a stored software program for implementing the user interface (see column 4, lines 10-12). Note, the office interprets the multiple adjustments included with the user interface (see Figure 3 of Lin et al.) equivalent to application programs. Lin et al. also discloses the user interface resembling a system menu showing adjustable items to tweak display settings (see column 4, lines 30-36 and Figure 3). Lin et al. discloses the user providing input to the computer system to select one or more of the display settings for adjustment (see column 4, lines 46-51). Lin et al. also discloses a display controller managing data displayed on an output monitor (see column 3, lines 45-50). Neither Bird nor Lin et al. explicitly disclose an operating system executing application programs however, it is well known in the art of computing devices to include some sort of operating system on a computer. An operating system manages information processing on a computer while handling memory requirements, input/output devices, software applications and more (Official Notice). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize an operating system to execute application programs with either the compact computer of Bird or the computer system of Lin et al. because it is well known in the art that operating systems are used to manage system

resources, such as memory and input/output devices, to provide an efficient computing device (see Response to Arguments below). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the compact computer of Bird and the well known stylus functionality of Chew et al. with the user interface menu of Lin et al. in order to allow a user to make adjustments to settings of an output display to customize the computer environment to his/her preference utilizing an on-screen display adjustment lowering, production costs and creating a less confusing interface (see columns 1-2, lines 67-15 of Lin et al.).

In reference to claims 7, 15, 23 and 31, Bird, Chew et al. and Lin et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claims 1, 9, 17 and 25 respectively above. Chew et al. discloses that the user can confirm settings on the screen by tapping an "OK" button, using the stylus, on the display screen which returns the user to the owner screen by dismissing the current screen (see column 5, lines 22-31 and Figure 7). Note, the office interprets the "dismissing" of the current screen of Chew et al. functionally equivalent to the canceling of a display of applicant's claims.

In reference to claims 8, 16 and 24, Bird, Chew et al. and Lin et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claims 1, 9 and 17 respectively. Lin et al. discloses a method and apparatus providing a user interface for control of a display device via a computer system (see columns 1-2, lines 66-7). Lin et al. also discloses the user interface resembling a system menu showing adjustable items to tweak display settings (see column 4, lines 30-36 and Figure 3).

In reference to claims 17 and 25, claims 17 and 25 are equivalent in scope to claims 1 and 9 above and therefore are rejected under similar rationale. Further, Lin et al. discloses selection of one processing item (interpreted as the adjustable attributes of the monitor display, shown in

Figure 3, "Bright," "Contrast," etc.) configuring the display monitor (see column 4, lines 46-57 and Figure 3). Lin et al. discloses the displaying of more, fewer or different display parameters in the user interface (see column 4, lines 42-45) therefore, the office believes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include an output signal format display parameter in the user interface of Lin et al. to select between different/multiple format output display devices, i.e. NTSC, PAL, VGA etc. The office interprets the setting of the format of an output display signal equivalent to a communication setting, between a display controller and display device, because of the definition of the term, "communicate" which reads, "(2) : to transmit information, thought or feeling so that it is satisfactorily received or understood," (see *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 10th edt.* Merriam-Webster, Inc. ©2002. page 232). The signal generating and receiving devices must operate on the same format signal so that signals are correctly understood and thus displayed accurately. Therefore, the office interprets such a communication setting as a second one of the processing items when displayed in the user interface of Lin et al.

In reference to claims 33 and 35, Bird, Chew et al. and Lin et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claims 17 and 25 respectively above. Lin et al. discloses the user interface configuring screen brightness/luminance of a display device (see column 4, lines 51-54 and Figure 3).

3. Claims 3, 11, 19, 27, 32, 34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bird (U.S. Patent 5,341,154), Chew et al. (U.S. Patent 6,727, 917 B1), Lin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,552,738 B1) and in further view of Nishida et al. (U.S. Patent Des. 409,583).

In reference to claims 3 and 11, Bird discloses a compact computer having a base with an alphanumeric keyboard and a display screen pivotally connected to the base so that it can fold inwards towards the base or pivoted into a position facing away from the base (see column 2, lines 9-15, Figure 1 and Figure 5). Bird also discloses a first operating means operable under the condition where the back surface of the display body is close to the base by using a stylus and touch screen display (see column 7, lines 4-14). Bird discloses the stylus to be used by a user to select an item from a menu being displayed on the touch screen display (see column 7, lines 38-40). Note, the office interprets the compact computer of Bird functionally equivalent to the information processing device of applicant's claims. Bird also discloses a retractable keypad which, the office interprets, may be used under the condition where the back surface of the display body is close to the base (see column 2, lines 59-62, #40 of Figures 3 and 5). Note, the office interprets the keypad located "outside" of the display body (see #40 Figure 3 is not apart of the display body) and the stylus provided on the display body but outside of the display screen as the stylus is connected to the display body using a pivot point located "outside" of the display screen (see column 7, lines 3-6 and 19-20 and #75 and 76 of Figure 5). Bird does not explicitly disclose using the keypad to select a processing item to be executed from a system menu however it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a keypad to navigate and select a menu item as it is well known in the art that a keypad can also be used as a selectable input device (#8 key = up, #4 key = left, #6 key = right, #2 key = down and enter) (Official Notice). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for Bird to implement the retractable keypad as a selectable input device because it is well known in the art that a keypad can mimic the functions of a keyboard's directional arrow

keys and also includes an enter key for making the selection (see Response to Arguments below). Bird does not explicitly disclose the operation of the first operating means under a specific condition, for example photograph mode, however, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a certain operating means when the display body of a computer was inaccessible and then utilize an alternate operating means when it was accessible. Applicant has not disclosed that utilizing the first operating means under photograph mode provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with the use of the stylus and touch screen when the back surface of the display body is close to the base because such an arrangement, shown in Figure 5 of Bird, is similar to the display arrangement found in applicant's drawings, Figure #7B. Further, the matter of when to operate the first operating means is seen as a matter of design choice as preferred by the designer and/or to which best suits the application at hand. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to modify Bird to obtain the invention as specified in claims 3 and 11. Although Bird also discloses that, "...the stylus tip provides an electrical signal which can be used to indicate the selection of a particular point on the display screen by the user," (see column 7, lines 34-37), Bird does not explicitly disclose displaying a system menu showing processing items based on said OS program on the display based on an operation of the stylus however Chew et al. does. Chew et al. discloses a user interface for palm sized computing devices whereby the user implements a stylus by tapping on the display screen which in turns displays a navigation menu (see column 1, lines 62-64, column 5, lines 6-10 and #86, 320 and 324 of Figure 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to display a system menu by utilizing the stylus of Bird as such functionally is explicitly state as well known in the art by Chew et al. (see column 5, lines 6-10). Although Bird discloses the compact computer to comprise of a microcontroller along with memory devices (see column 3, lines 52-54), Bird does not explicitly disclose the compact computer executing application programs however, Lin et al. does. Lin et al. discloses a method and apparatus providing a user interface for control of a display device via a computer system (see columns 1-2, lines 66-7). Lin et al. discloses the computer system including a stored software program for implementing the user interface (see column 4, lines 10-12). Note, the office interprets the multiple adjustments included with the user interface (see Figure 3 of Lin et al.) equivalent to application programs. Lin et al. also discloses the user interface resembling a system menu showing adjustable items to tweak display settings (see column 4, lines 30-36 and Figure 3). Lin et al. discloses the user providing input to the computer system to select one or more of the display settings for adjustment (see column 4, lines 46-51). Lin et al. also discloses a display controller managing data displayed on an output monitor (see column 3, lines 45-50). Neither Bird nor Lin et al. explicitly disclose an operating system executing application programs however, it is well known in the art of computing devices to include some sort of operating system on a computer. An operating system manages information processing on a computer while handling memory requirements, input/output devices, software applications and more (Official Notice). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize an operating system to execute application programs with either the compact computer of Bird or the computer system of Lin et al. because it is well known in the art that operating systems are used to manage system resources, such as memory and

input/output devices, to provide an efficient computing device. Neither Bird nor Lin et al. explicitly disclose a photographing case having a photographic function however Nishida et al. does. Nishida et al. discloses a laptop computer with an integrated camera attached thereto (see Figures 13-15 of Nishida et al.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the compact computer of Bird, the well known stylus functionality of Chew et al. and the user interface of Lin et al. with the laptop and camera attached thereto of Nishida et al. in order to allow the user to view the display screen while taking a photograph of someone/something or adjusting display settings, creating a more efficient and user friendly computer environment.

In reference to claims 19 and 27, claims 19 and 27 are equivalent in scope to claims 3 and 11 above and therefore are rejected under similar rationale. Further, Lin et al. discloses selection of one processing item (interpreted as the adjustable attributes of the monitor display, shown in Figure 3, "Bright," "Contrast," etc.) configuring the display monitor (see column 4, lines 46-57 and Figure 3). Lin et al. discloses the displaying of more, fewer or different display parameters in the user interface (see column 4, lines 42-45) therefore, the office believes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include an output signal format display parameter in the user interface of Lin et al. to select between different/multiple format output display devices, i.e. NTSC, PAL, VGA etc. The office interprets the setting of the format of an output display signal equivalent to a communication setting, between a display controller and display device, because of the definition of the term, "communicate" which reads, "(2) : to transmit information, thought or feeling so that it is satisfactorily received or understood," (see *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 10th edt.* Merriam-Webster, Inc. ©2002. page 232).

The signal generating and receiving devices must operate on the same format signal so that signals are correctly understood and thus displayed accurately. Therefore, the office interprets such a communication setting as a second one of the processing items when displayed in the user interface of Lin et al.

In reference to claim 32, Bird, Chew et al., Lin et al. and Nishida et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 27 above. Lin et al. discloses a method and apparatus providing a user interface for control of a display device via a computer system (see columns 1-2, lines 66-7). Lin et al. also discloses the user interface resembling a system menu showing adjustable items to tweak display settings (see column 4, lines 30-36 and Figure 3).

In reference to claims 34 and 36, Bird, Chew et al., Lin et al. and Nishida et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claims 19 and 27 respectively above. Lin et al. discloses the user interface configuring screen brightness/luminance of a display device (see column 4, lines 51-54 and Figure 3).

4. Claims 5, 13, 21 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bird (U.S. Patent 5,341,154), Chew et al. (U.S. Patent 6,727, 917 B1), Lin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,552,738 B1) and further in view of Someya et al. (U.S. Patent 6,546,231 B1).

In reference to claims 5, 13, 21 and 29, Bird, Chew et al. and Lin et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claims 1, 9, 17 and 25 respectively above. Bird discloses the stylus and touch screen to be operated by pressing the tip against the display screen (see column 7, lines 38-40). Neither Bird nor Lin et al. explicitly disclose the keypad, or second operating means, to be rotated however Someya et al. does. Someya et al. discloses a communication terminal device implementing an operation key designed to be rotated, pushed or slid (see

column 1, lines 51-52 and column 2, lines 31-33 of Someya et al.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the "jog dial", of Someya et al., that can be rotated and pushed with the compact computer of Bird, the well known stylus functionality of Chew et al. and the user interface of Lin et al. in order to provide a convenient user input device creating a fast and easy way to select items in a menu, for example (see column 2, lines 31-36 of Someya et al.).

5. Claims 6, 14, 22 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bird (U.S. Patent 5,341,154), Chew et al. (U.S. Patent 6,727, 917 B1), Lin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,552,738 B1), Nishida et al. (U.S. Patent Des. 409,583) and further in view of Someya et al. (U.S. Patent 6,546,231 B1).

In reference to claims 6, 14, 22 and 30, Bird, Chew et al., Lin et al. and Nishida et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claims 3, 11, 19 and 27 respectively above. Bird discloses the stylus and touch screen to be operated by pressing the tip against the display screen (see column 7, lines 38-40). Bird, Lin et al. and Nishida et al. do not explicitly disclose the keypad, or second operating means, to be rotated however Someya et al. does. Someya et al. discloses a communication terminal device implementing an operation key designed to be rotated, pushed or slid (see column 1, lines 51-52 and column 2, lines 31-33 of Someya et al.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the "jog dial", of Someya et al., that can be rotated and pushed with the compact computer Bird, the well known stylus functionality of Chew et al., the user interface of Lin et al. and laptop/camera design of Nishida et al. in order to provide a convenient user input device

creating a fast and easy way to select items in a photographic menu, for example (see column 2, lines 31-36 of Someya et al.).

Response to Arguments

8. The cancellation of claims 2, 4, 10, 12, 18, 20, 26 and 28 is noted.

9. Applicant's arguments, see page 16 of. "Applicant's Remarks" (Amendment B), filed 3/24/2004, with respect to the specification, have been fully considered and are persuasive. Minor informalities have been corrected within the specification and therefore, the objection to the specification has been withdrawn.

10. Applicant's arguments filed 3/24/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In reference to applicant's request that the examiner cite prior art to further support the positions taken under Official Notice (see page 16, last paragraph of Amendment B, Applicant's Remarks), the office provides two documents, a printout of a webpage defining the term, "Operating System" and U.S. Patent 6,029,076 (Fiddian-Greene et al.) to show the functionality of a computer keypad. In particular, the office stated in the above rejection of claims 1, 3, 9, 11, 17, 19, 25 and 27, "An operating system manages information processing on a computer while handling memory requirements, input/output devices, software applications and more (Official Notice)." The definition of an operating system as defined by a glossary of terms, provided by the National Y2K Clearinghouse, recites, "Software that controls the execution of computer programs. An organized collection of routines and procedures for operating a computer. Functions performed include: (1) scheduling, loading, initiating, and supervising the execution of

programs; (2) allocating storage; (3) initiating and controlling input/output operations; and (4) handling errors," (see "Operating System," National Y2K Clearing house,Y2K Glossary of Terms. http://www.y2k.gov/got.html). Clearly, the above definition provides sufficient support for the Official Notice taken by the examiner and therefore the office maintains its rejection.

Further, the office stated in the above rejection of claims 1, 3, 9, 11, 17, 19, 25 and 27, "...it is well known in the art that a keypad can also be used as a selectable input device (#8 key = up, #4 key = left, #6 key = right, #2 key = down and enter) (Official Notice)." Fiddian-Greene et al. disclose medical diagnostic equipment (see column 1, lines 25-27) whereby a computer keypad is utilized for selecting operation modes from a menu of the computer (see column 25, lines 54-56). From the above disclosure of Fiddian-Greene et al., it is clear that such a limitation is well known. Even further, the mere fact that the Fiddian-Greene et al. reference is directed to a totally different art and yet still discloses that a keypad can be used as a selectable input device is further evidence for the well known claim by the office. Note, such rationale can also be applied to Applicant's Arguments from Amendment B, page 19, 4th paragraph which is directed towards the keypad of Bird.

In reference to claims 1, 3, 9, 11, 17, 19, 25 and 27, applicant argues that the "first operating means" is clearly distinguishable over Bird's stylus by stating that the stylus in Bird is part of a display body (see page 18, 6th paragraph of Amendment B, Applicant's Remarks). The office notes that the amended claim language of the above claims states, "one of said first and second operating means is provided outside of said display body..." (see last lines of claim 1, for example). The office uses the keypad of Bird to overcome such a feature of being, "outside" of the display body as the above recitation from the claims suggests an option of either the first

operating means (stylus of Bird) or the second (keypad of Bird) maybe located "outside" of the display body. Therefore, the office interprets Bird to overcome such a limitation.

Lastly, in reference to claims 1, 3, 9, 11, 17, 19, 25 and 27, applicant argues that, "...the operation of the keypad for a specific condition," is not a matter of design choice (see pages 19-20, 5th-3rd paragraphs of Amendment B, Applicant's Remarks). The applicant also discloses that the examiner has dismissed several features in the claims as design choice (see page 20, 2nd paragraph) however the office disagrees. The office explains that the decision of when to operate the first operating means is seen as a matter of design choice whereby, for example, a designer could chose to allow for the keypad of Bird to operate when the display panel is in tablet mode (see Figure 5 of Bird) or when in common laptop computing mode (see Figure 2). Likewise, the stylus of Bird maybe chosen to be functional in either of the above modes with simple modification to the present configuration of Bird. Some of the above claims discuss utilizing the first and second operating means in a, "photographic mode," which resembles the tablet mode of Bird (see Figure 7D of instant application and Figure 5 of Bird). The office asserts that no matter what the orientation of the display screen of Bird, the stylus and keypad of Bird could be chosen to be operable and effective as input devices for the system.

References Cited

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

a. Agata et al. (U.S. Patent 6,680,845 B2)

- Agata et al. discloses an information processing apparatus wherein a camera section is attached to a computer body.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Antonio Caschera whose telephone number is (703) 305-1391. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays between 7:00 AM and 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella, can be reached at (703)-308-6829.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

aac

5/10/04

Matthew C. Bella

MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600